

THE  
VINDICATION  
OF

A. Crefner,

School-Master in LONG-ACRE,

From the Aspersions of

A. P U L T O N,

Jesuit and School-Master in the S A V O Y;

Together

With some Account of His Discourse  
with Mr. M E R E D I T H.

---

Imprimatur,

Octob. 24. 1687.

*Hic Liber cui Titulus* [The Vindication of  
A. Crefner, &c.]

H. Maurice Reverendissimo in Christo P. D.  
Wilhelmo Archiep. Cant. à Sacris.

---

L O N D O N,  
Printed for Ric. Chiswell at the Rose and Crown in  
St. Paul's Church-Yard. MDCLXXXVII.



---



---

THE  
VINDICATION  
OF

A. C R E S N E R,

School-Master in L O N G - A C R E.

“ **H**ERE a pleasant School-Master di-  
 “ verted the Auditory, with a Pi-  
 “ cture (as he pretended) of the  
 “ Blessed Trinity, which he shew-  
 “ ed me, with wry Mouths, and many antick  
 “ Gestures; upon this I told him of God’s ap-  
 “ pearing in the shape of an Old Man, and  
 “ that we might Picture him, so we meant  
 “ not to delineate him *sub specie propriâ*.  
 “ I turn’d to the Doctor, and press’d my fore-  
 “ mention’d Argument, but the School-Master  
 “ continuing to give Diversion to the Compa-  
 “ ny, and throw in Impertinent Questions, I bid  
 “ him be silent, saying, I came not to Dispute  
 “ with

Mr. Pulton’s  
Aspersions in  
his Narrative.



“ with a Buffoon, but a Doctor. Thus far our Disputant, to which I Answer;

A Vindication  
of A. C.

That our Jesuit cannot be Ignorant of the Method *A. C.* us'd in his Discourse with him, without putting violence upon his Understanding, and wilfully resolving to Mis-represent his Adversarie's Arguments whatever it cost him. He tells us *A. C.* was pleasant, and indeed so he was, and he that could keep his Temper amidst a company of such singular Arguments, as *M. P.* vented in defence of his Cause, he that could be so grave, as to deny himself the liberty of a Smile, at the singularity of *M. P.*'s Reasonings, hath really greater share of Mortification, than ever *A. C.* could pretend to. But our Jesuit may Object, What had *A. C.* to do, to speak in a Cause he had nothing to do with, was not the Doctor able to defend his Religion, without borrowing the Assistance of a By-stander, who yet appear'd impertinent enough in what he said? As for the Impertinency of it, that shall come in in its place; 'twill I hope be sufficient to rectifie Misapprehensions of this Matter, and to justify the procedure of *A. C.* if the Reader be acquainted with the Motives that influenc'd him to speak his Thoughts of what was said by our Disputant. The occasion then was this.

The occasion  
of A. C.'s  
speaking to  
Mr. Pulton.

The Reverend *D. T.* being sometimes engaged with *M. M.* who sat at his Left Hand, and who would several times interpose with private Questions of his own, though *D. T.* was never so closely engag'd with our Disputant; 'twas the little Equity that appear'd in this sort of conduct that urg'd *A. C.* to deliver his Sentiments of the Subject disputed of, but still with respect to the very foul play us'd by our Adversaries. But what say our Jesuit to all this? why truly just nothing, but



but on the contrary would insinuate to the World, that all that *A. C.* did in relation to the Conference, was abrupt and without necessity : I must confess if our Jesuit's bare saying all this was true, was sufficient to prove it so ; it were an unpardonable Presumption in any Man to go about to perswade the World into a contrary Opinion ; but because it is hop'd that *A. C.* may find better luck, than to be so unmercifully used, he comes now to give the World a true representation of his own Deportment at the Conference.

And First, *A. C.* cannot forbear wondring, at our Jesuit's forwardness to Insinuate to the World, as though *A. C.* produc'd a resemblance of the Blessed Trinity (which is delineated in their own *Breviary*, set out by the Authorities of *Pius* the 5<sup>th</sup>. and *Clement* 8<sup>th</sup>.) abruptly and without any regard to the particular Subject disputed of ; which if it had been so (as it was not) it were but equitable and fair to follow our Authors Example, who first pull'd out of his Pocket a *Breviary* to help his Memory, which would certainly have been at a loss without it. Is then our Author become so Criminal, that it is dangerous for any Man to follow his Example, without being reproach'd for it ? for otherwise, how comes the same Action to be both prudent and safe in our Disputant, and yet ridiculous and dangerous in another, when the external Circumstances that produc'd that Action were both the same. *M. P.* pull'd his *Breviary* out of his Pocket to assist his own Memory, and his Adversary produces another *Breviary* to relieve his ; this is really the Case : yet 'tis this Action our Jesuit takes so much pains to discredit ; if there be any thing indecent in the Action, our Disputant ought to have given a better Example. Our Jesuit hath here a great mind to be thought in the right, and therefore says, that what

*A. C.*

The true representation of the Words and Actions which Mr. P. hath so much misrepresented ; together with their Defence.

*A. C.* had shown him, he pretended to be the resemblance of the Blessed Trinity. But what does our Disputant mean by pretended? not sure that he himself had no other way of knowing it to be so, than *A. C.*'s bare affirming that it was such a resemblance, and yet there can be no other Sense put upon this Word, than is here put upon it; for *A. C.* shew'd it him (the Jesuit) who look'd on it, endeavouring withal to justify the Practice of their Church in this particular, without offering at any other way of doing it, than by producing that Text in *Daniel Cap. 7. ver. 9.* which I shall speak to in its place. But then,

Secondly, This pulling out the *Breviary* hath yet a greater Justification attending it, than *M. P.* is willing to make the World believe it hath; and which if prov'd, may go near to relieve this Action from Impertinency. Our Disputant having objected to *D. T.* (who spake of the share the *Greeks* ought to have in our Belief as well as other Churches, in their handing down the Bible to us (as a part at least of the Universal Church) that the Testimony of the *Greeks* could not be rely'd upon, because of their denial of the Procession of the Third Person of the Trinity from the two First. *D. T.* going to answer our Disputant, was interrupted by *M. M.* In this Interval *A. C.* seeing the Jesuit disengag'd, told him, That as for the *Greeks*, their Dispute was about Phrases, and that they were agreed in Sense; further adding, that upon that score, they were far more justifiable in an unwillful mistake of a Term and Mode of Expression, than the *Roman Church*, who brought down the Glory of the Adorable Trinity, into the pitiful resemblance of a Picture, thus doing more mischief by their unwarrantable Practices, than these *Greeks* by their Doctrine: whereupon *A. C.* turn'd to the place, where this delineation was, and shew'd it our Jesuit.

And



And now let the World judge where the impertinency of this action lay, and whether it was half so ridiculous as our Disputants making use of his *Speculum*, where his Lesson was prick'd ready to his hand, instead of answering like a Schollar that had undertaken the Cause of his Church. But were these all the impertinent Actions *A. C.* is charged with? No, our Disputant hath not only discover'd Impertinency, but a great deal of rudeness in *A. C.*'s procedure: but pray let us hear what 'tis; why he tells the World, "That *A. C.* shew'd "him the Picture with wry Mouths and many Antick Gestures. Why truly this is a heavy Charge, and little befitting a Protestant who had the honour to speak in the defence of his Religion, which, if true, would go near to make him resolve never to venture in the Defence of his Religion, if he could not do it without so many guilty Actions. But what if this Charge should prove (as I am afraid it will) to be false, and nothing but Calumny, what will become of *M. P.*'s Reputation, and that mighty Esteem he hath acquired amongst his own Party, of being so well vers'd in all those Qualifications, that are requisite to consummate an able Disputant? I am afraid *M. P.* is grown a little unwary of late, that he is so ready to venture his Reputation without considering what may be the Consequences which will attend the proof of his unfair dealing. But perhaps our Jesuite may not be satisfied, unless it be prov'd that what he charges *A. C.* with, is very far from being true, which I shall endeavour to do, that I may satisfy our Jesuite's longing.

1<sup>st</sup>. Then I answer, *A. C.* is very sure he never kept a stricter guard upon his Actions, than at this Dispute, as not being influenc'd in the least by any Passion, though never more provok'd than at this time, being by our Disputant call'd by a very hard Name, which, had *A. C.*  
been



been inclin'd to any Passion, in the Dispute, that unchristian usage of our Jesuite, might have justified the most extravagant one : But on the contrary, *A. C.* mildly replied, That as for unkind Words, he was resolv'd he would not make use of any, that he would come behind our Jesuite in nothing, but in that sort of Language which he was too well acquainted with, to begin to use it now: adding moreover, that he would do our Jesuite all the kindness that lay in his power, having always that notable Saying of a Worthy Gentleman in his mind, "That it was the method of Charity to suffer without re-actior Dares our Disputant say that I gave him the least ill Word? I confess part of this Discourse was used with our Jesuite after the Dispute of the Counsels of *Constance* and *Trent*; but however, this is sufficient to prove the mildness *A. C.* used towards our Disputant, in that there was most part of this spoken after *M. M.* had endeavoured to justify *M. P.* in this sort of Rudeness.

2ly. The *Æquanimity* of *A. C.*'s Deportment under these Circumstances, may be partly guess'd from the little disturbance, the weakness of our Disputant's Argument could give an Adversary; but whether they were so or no, the Conference will best discover. Men are usually calm and sedate, when they have an answer ready to the Objections of their Antagonist. And on the contrary, 'tis then they fly into passion, when any thing presses them that they cannot answer; and that I suppose made our Jesuite (instead of answering *A. C.*'s Objections) call him *Buffoon*, unless this last Word hath some extraordinary sense in it, which no Mortal, besides our Disputant, hath yet been able to pick out of it; and if it hath, *M. P.* ought to have decyphered it, that the World may be taught for the future, to answer by whole-sale, without using that tedious way of twenty Words, when one will do :

do : but if no man can find any thing in the Word, but virulency and bitterness, as indeed they cannot, how can our Disputant evade the force of that Reproof the Reverend D. T. gave him, upon his using it to A. C. ? But what then ? Did M. P. give A. C. no other answer ? Why truly yes ; he told A. C. That the Representation of the Trinity was no such strange thing, seeing that in *Daniel*, God had appeared in the shape of an old Man, and that we might Picture him, so we mean not to delineate him *sub specie propria*. To this A. C. answered (which our Adversary hath conceal'd) That as for the Text before us, what this Prophet saw, was only in a Vision, which was a Representation of Gods coming to Judgment, and fitted only to that particular occasion ; and therefore ought not to be prostituted to all intents and purposes whatsoever : and then for the lawfulness of representing God, provided it was not meant to do it *sub specie propria*, A. C. answers now, (he confesses he did not answer to this last part of the Objection at the Conference) Any one may see (if he will but take a little pains) the vanity of this distinction ; for if God's Image be not given us *sub specie propria*, with relation to his own Essence, 'tis no more the Image of God, but the Sign of his Power which is represented in the above-mentioned Chapter of *Daniel* ; his Throne was like the fiery flame, &c. But suppose all our Disputant says were true, what comfort could it be to a poor Soul, who is charged with dishonouring God, who is Infinite, by representing him by an Image that is Finite, and terminated by visible Dimensions, to be told by M. P. that he do's not dishonour God, because he hath no intention to represent him *sub specie propria* ? But because A. C. said not this at the Conference, he does intend to add but one Word, or two more : And first, That he might here observe, that if it were granted, that we might picture each of the Three



Persons of the B. Trinity apart ; that this could be no argument at all, for it's resembling it (the Trinity), because such Resemblances does not only make Three Persons, but Three Gods ; such Images as these, represent not only a distinction of Persons, but a diversity of Substance. I leave our Jesuite to think of this ; for it is not *A. C.*'s meaning to enlarge on this Subject, as intending only to give a Relation of what he said at the Conference. Our Disputant goes on, telling us, That the School-Master (meaning *A. C.*) still interposing with *impertinent Questions*, *M. P.* bad him be silent ; but I would fain know of our Jesuite, which of those Questions were *Impertinent*. If he means by this Word, that the *Questions* *A. C.* asked, were not at all to our Jesuits purpose, which was to make the *Spectators* believe, he was very knowing in those things he talked of with so much freedom, and of which, all unbyass'd persons at the Assembly found he was very ignorant : *A. C.* is very ready to confess that he was impertinent enough ; but because (it may be) our Disputant may take impertinency in it's most ordinary sence, *A. C.* need not clear himself here, because it is already done to his hand in the Body of the Conference, whither I refer the Reader for satisfaction in this point. *D. T.* finding *M. P.* to be very ignorant of common Church-History, which he perceived by the Answers our Jesuite made him, *D. T.* pressed *M. P.* about the Council of *Lateran* : This Disputant having first nam'd this Council himself (where the term Transubstantiation was invented, to express the Corporeal Presence, after the year 1200, after it had been broached by *Paschasius Radbertus*, in the year 818.) but while this was asking, *M. M.* pulled *D. T.* to be satisfied about some Questions he had to propose. *A. C.* (seeing *D. T.* engaged with *M. M.*) took up the Jesuit, and made an end of what *D. T.* had began by asking our Jesuit



suit, some important Questions, which concerned the *Lateran* Council, which no Persons (that had but the least knowledge of this Council by any other way, than that of Quotation) could be ignorant of: As, How many Fathers there were, who presided in it, &c. To the first he answers, a Thousand, and to the last, nothing. In all our Jesuit's Accusations of *A. C.* we have not one word of what was answered, neither of what *A. C.* replied occasionally when standing by *D. T.* nor what was urged in the last Room betwixt our Disputant and *A. C.* about the contradictions of the Two Councils, *Constance* and *Trent*, upon the question of the Pope's Superiority. All this our Jesuit hath quite slipt over, either wilfully or forgetfully, I shall not determine which: If the first, our Disputant hath unworthily prevaricated in the cause of God, and render'd the Protestants cause weak and impotent, which I am sure is not the part of a Gentleman, nor a Scholar: if the last, it had been the part of a prudent person to have taken surer measures, to have acted more cautiously in a thing of this Consequence, before he had ventured to have treated *A. C.* with so much virulency and contempt: but to prevent all misrepresentation, I shall annex the Discourse *A. C.* had both with *M. M.* and our Disputant, at the end of this Paper, which, according to the exactest care I could take, of neither adding any thing on *A. C.*'s side, or omitting on his Adversaries, was thus: When the Question of [How the Protestants could tell that the Bible they used, was really what they, (the Protestants) thought it to be, the Word of God,]

had been canvass'd some while, *M. M.* arising, went to the other end of the Room, whither *A. C.* follow'd him, desiring some satisfaction about the prohibition in the Second Commandment; *A. C.* telling him, that this way of worshipping of God, and the Saints (besides the utter unlawfulness of worshipping the latter, either ultimately

An Account  
of the Conference be-  
twixt *M. M.*  
and *A. C.* a-  
bout the Con-  
fessional.

or relatively) by Representations, they brought down the Glory of Holiness, which consisted in the Excellency of inward Dispositions, to the contemptible lowness of being beholden, for the most indistracted part of our Devotion to the sight of an Image; which is a readier way to advance, than to cure our Distraction; that it was much more agreeable to the Precepts of the Gospel, to serve God after his own Prescription, who being a Spirit, our Saviour tells us, *must be worshipped in Spirit and in Truth*. M. M. answer'd, That we were Finite Creatures, and what conceptions we had of God, could be no more than finite neither; and therefore why not by an Image? The first part of this I granted, but must not, I told him, allow of his Inference, telling him, we ought to come as near to the Nature of God as possible, in our Devotions to him; but that would best be done, by a Worship, abstracted from all material representations of him. To this M. M. answered, Well, well; and from thence began to preach me a Moral Lecture, which I heartily thank'd him for; and so we parted for that time, he to the Conversation of some Women of his Acquaintance, and A. C. to the place of Dispute; whither he went some time after to M. M. again, who was then at the Window; but there happening a little time after, a Discourse about the Confessional, (A. C. does not exactly remember for what Reasons the Question was started) A. C. asked M. M. What if a Person that was a Traytor to the Kingdom or State, of which he was a Subject, and was actually in Conspiracy with others against that Kingdom or State; if this Traytor should come, and reveal this Conspiracy to a Priest, by way of Confession, must that Priest reveal the horrid Secret or not? To which M. M. reply'd, No; that Priest must not disclose it. What! replied A. C. and must such a Kingdom or State, be involv'd in Blood and ruine, for  
want



want of such an Obedience as Indispensibly obliges every Subject of what Capacity soever, not to be wanting in his utmost endeavours for the preservation of that Kingdom or State he owes all the Happinesses of Life to? To this M. M. reply'd, That all this was nothing, all that the Priest could do in this matter, was to deny him Absolution, if he did not Repent. And is this (repeated A. C.) all the security a King or Kingdom must expect from you in such a juncture of Affairs? Is not the Priest (by taking Methods like these) actually enrolled in the Number of the Conspirators? are not they as sure of him in relation to secrecie, as of the greatest Desperado in all their Cabal? Is it very likely, that Fellows desperately resolv'd to do such barbarous Acts of Wickedness, will be much mov'd or concern'd at your denial of Absolution to them? To this M. M. reply'd, That A. C. was out in his Conceptions, for the Priest did not help the Conspirators by these means. And seeing him stop there, A. C. answer'd, And is it possible that such an Ingenious Man as M. M. can be guilty of so great an absurdity, as to say (as you do) that the Priest does not help the Conspirators, because he does not actually make some endeavours himself towards the promotion of such a deed of darkness? To all which A. C. could have nothing returned, but, That if the Priest did deny him Absolution, he had done his Duty. After which A. C. had no further Discourse with M. M. nor any other, till a part of the Company retired into another Room, whither A. C. follow'd them, and engag'd himself with the Jesuit, about the Decrees of some later Councils, as those of *Constance* and *Trent*, against which he endeavour'd to prove a Contradiction in their Decrees; the first of these setting up the Council above the Pope; the latter deciding the direct contrary, setting up the Pope

An Account  
of the Conference  
betwixt  
our Jesuit and  
A. C.



Pope above the Council. *A. C.* affirm'd, That this first Council could not be Infallible, because it had not been Conven'd by a Lawful Pope, but had assembled it self at the Sollicitation of Christian Princes, and by the sole Authority and Power of the College of Cardinals: Now if a Council cannot be Infallible without the Pope in Person or by his Legates, then it is plain this Council was not Infallible, because there was no true Pope in being; for it conven'd to condemn three false ones; now were the Acts during the Interval of this Council Infallible or not? To which *M. P.* answer'd in the affirmative. To which *A. C.* reply'd, What, without a Pope? To this our Disputant said, That this signified little, so long as the Pope confirm'd what the Council had done; and when *A. C.* reply'd, That the question was not about the Infallibility of the Decrees after Confirmation; but whither the Decisions of the Council before Confirmation were Obligatory upon Mens Consciences, so as to oblige all Persons of what Capacity soever, to act in pursuance of them; and if they were, then such submission must be due to them, by vertue of some Infallible Authority enjoyning such submission; but the Authority that enjoyn'd the Execution of the Canons of this Council, was not Infallible, because it wanted an Essential part of its Infallibility, *viz.* the Presence of the Pope in Person, or by his Legats; thus these Qualifications being wanting, the Authority that exacted Obedience to their Decrees, was fallible; and upon that score, could not indispensibly oblige any Individual Member of their Church to submit to it with an implicit Obedience. *M. P.* still urged the Confirmation (which the Pope gave the Acts of this Council) for their being infallible, and therefore Universally Obligatory. *A. C.* seeing our Disputant could not be made to drop this Insignificant shift, asked him  
what

what that was the Pope confirmed ? an Error ? For  
 amongst the Acts of this Council, the Supremacy of a  
 Council above a Pope was actually decreed ; but  
 the Council of *Trent* which came afterward, decreed  
 just the contrary : Now one of these Councils was  
 certainly mistaken, for their Canons (which respect  
 this Article) are form'd in direct contrariety to each  
 other ; this Council coming under debate, *A. C.* ask'd  
 our Jesuit, What he thought of the Decree made at  
*Trent* about the Forfeiture that Princes were to suffer,  
 in Case they should permit any Duellings in their Ter-  
 ritories ? The Import of the Decree in *English* runs  
 in this Sense, in short, *viz.* That if the places on which  
 the Duels were fought, be Fief Lands, they shall  
 Escheat to the Lords of the Fiefe ; I do not exactly  
 remember whether our Disputant objected that Clause  
*quod ab Ecclesia obtinent*, which implies that the For-  
 feiture should only be of those Lands that were hol-  
 den of the Church ; and if our Jesuit did object this,  
 (because I would not omit any thing material he said  
 in his defence) *A. C.* answers in the Words of a late  
 Ingenious Gentleman, who says, That that Clause,  
*quod ab Ecclesia obtinent*, was inserted into the Decree,  
 only to hinder the opposition that would have been  
 made by the Ambassadors of Kings and Princes, who  
 were present in that Council, and who would never  
 have let pass a Decree so destructive of their Master's  
 Interests ; from all which *A. C.* Inferred, He that can  
 by Virtue of some Right residing in himself, dispose  
 (upon any pretence whatsoever) of a parcel of Land as big  
 as this Room (speaking of the Room he was in) may take  
 away a Province, and he that may *Jure suo* take away  
 a Province ; may rifle a Prince of his Dominions ; but  
 that is deposing of them : To which *M. P.* reply'd,  
 No such thing, for if my Prince shall lay upon me a  
 moderate



moderate Tax, hath therefore that Prince a Right to all I have? To which *A. C.* answer'd, No, adding, That what *M. P.* urg'd as a Simile, was not at all like the thing we disputed of; for the Question was not of the Power of Princes over their Subjects, but the Jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical State, over that of the Civil one, without this latter States leave; to which *M. P.* reply'd All good Princes ought to consent to the Decisions of the Church; But answer'd, *A. C.* suppose those good Princes are not in a very good Humour (as 'tis ten to one if they are, when the Church decides so favourably for her self) and have no mind to recede from their Right to any part or parts of their Dominions, of which they are the true owners; must they be dispossest'd of their Rights against their Wills? To all which *A. C.* had no other answer than this, or much to the same Effect, *viz.* That in such a Case the Church had power to decide in favour of it self. Well, says *A. C.* to our Jesuit, if the Case be so, I am satisfied; and withal turned himself away, and had some Discourse with a Gentleman by the Bed side.

## F I N I S.

---

## E R R A T A.

*On the Title for Crefner, r. Cressener. pag. 2. line 12. for greater r. a greater, p. 7. l. 30. for Term and Mode, r. Term or Mode.*